



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/761,659	01/20/2004	Yen-Hsiung Tseng	67,200-1224	3385

7590 12/14/2005

TUNG & ASSOCIATES
Suite 120
838 W. Long Lake Road
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48302

EXAMINER

MOORE, KARLA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1763

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/761,659

Applicant(s)

TSENG ET AL.

Examiner

Karla Moore

Art Unit

1763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 1763

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-2 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,697,750 to Fishkin et al.

3. Fishkin et al. disclose a load lock chamber comprising: a chamber wall (16) defining a chamber interior; a bellows housing (40) defined by said chamber wall; a lift shaft opening (on lower surface of 40) provided in said bellows housing and sealing said shaft opening from said chamber interior; a lift shaft (24) having a cassette stage (26) extending through said shaft opening and said bellows into said chamber interior; a bellows mount frame (26) carried by said lift shaft; and a flexible bellows (38) carried by said bellows mount frame in said bellows housing and sealing said shaft opening from said chamber interior.

4. The load lock further comprises a shaft rotation device (32) operably engaging said lift shaft for rotating said lift shaft and said cassette stage in said chamber interior.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly

Art Unit: 1763

owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary.

Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 3-4, 7-8 and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fishkin et al. as applied to claims 1-2 and 10-11 above in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,908,095 to Kagatsume et al.

8. Fishkin et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed and as described above.

9. However, Fishkin et al. fail to teach said bellows comprises a metal alloy, such as stainless steel.

10. Kagatsume et al. teach providing a bellows comprising a metal alloy in a processing apparatus for the purpose of shielding dust (column 5, rows 52-57).

11. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to have provided bellows comprising a metal alloy in Fishkin et al. in order to shield dust as taught by Kagatsume et al.

12. Claims 5, 14, 17 and 20 are is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fishkin et al. as applied to claims 1-2 and 10-11 above in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,324,540 to Terada.

13. Fishkin et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed and as described above.

14. However, Fishkin et al. fail to teach said shaft rotation device comprises a housing and a housing magnet provided in said housing for magnetically rotating said lift shaft.

15. Terada teaches the use of an annular housing magnet (Figure 2, 26) and a magnet housing (66) as rotation means of a shaft in a processing apparatus for the purpose of providing a mechanism that can provide the necessary rotation and also allow for particles caused by the rotation to be confined and not enter into a processing region, thus preventing contamination (column 7, rows 43-49).

16. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to have provided a magnet and housing for the magnet as rotation means in Fishkin et al. in

Art Unit: 1763

order to provide the necessary rotation and also allow particles caused by the rotation to be confined and not enter into a processing region, thus preventing contamination as taught by Terada.

17. Claims 6, 15-16 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fishkin et al. and Terada as applied to claim 5, 14, 17 and 20 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,908,095 to Kagatsume et al.

18. Fishkin et al. and Terada disclose the invention substantially as claimed and as described above.

19. However, Fishkin et al. and Terada fail to teach said bellows comprises a metal alloy, such as stainless steel.

20. Kagatsume et al. teach providing a bellows comprising a metal alloy in a processing apparatus for the purpose of shielding dust (column 5, rows 52-57).

21. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to have provided bellows comprising a metal alloy in Fishkin et al. and Terada in order to shield dust as taught by Kagatsume et al.

22. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fishkin et al. and Kagatsume et al. as applied to claims 3-4, 7-8 and 12-13 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,324,540 to Terada.

23. Fishkin et al. and Kagatsume et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed and as described above.

24. However, Fishkin et al. and Kagatsume et al. fail to teach said shaft rotation device comprises a housing and a housing magnet provided in said housing for magnetically rotating said lift shaft.

25. Terada teaches the use of a magnet (Figure 2, 26) and a magnet housing (66) as rotation means of a shaft in a processing apparatus for the purpose of providing a mechanism that can provide the necessary rotation and also allow for particles caused by the rotation to be confined and not enter into a processing region, thus preventing contamination (column 7, rows 43-49).

Art Unit: 1763

26. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to have provided a magnet and housing for the magnet as rotation means in Fishkin et al. and Kagatsume et al. in order to provide the necessary rotation and also allow particles caused by the rotation to be confined and not enter into a processing region, thus preventing contamination as taught by Terada.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karla Moore whose telephone number is 571.272.1440. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00 am-6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Parviz Hassanzadeh can be reached on 571.272.1435. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Karla Moore
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1763
11 December 2005